



Town of Sudbury

Historic Districts Commission

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-639-3314

HistoricDistricts@sudbury.ma.us

www.sudbury.ma.us/historicdistricts

MINUTES

APRIL 2, 2020 AT 7:30 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING

Members Present: Chair Fred Taylor, William Andreas, Linda Hawes, and Frank Riepe

Members Absent: Lee Swanson

Others Present: Director of Planning and Community Development Adam Duchesneau and Planning and Zoning Coordinator Beth Perry

Mr. Taylor called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

New Business:

1. CONTINUED Public Hearing – Case 19-9, 322 Concord Road (Town Assessor’s Map H09-0062), Applicant Town of Sudbury seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate the Town Hall building for accessibility and code compliance. Proposed renovations include an addition for code required restrooms, the Town Clerk’s office, and accessible entry from the parking lot, as well as an accessible ramp for the main entryway, among other items.

Mr. Taylor motioned to continue the public hearing for the 322 Concord Road (Town Hall) Certificate of Appropriateness application to the Historic Districts Commission meeting on May 7, 2020. Mr. Riepe seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Taylor – Aye, Andreas – Aye, Hawes – Aye, and Riepe – Aye.

2. CONTINUED Public Hearing – Case 20-06, 248 Concord Road (Assessor’s Map H09-0020), Applicant Studio Insitu Architects, Inc. seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the intermediate connector piece between the main masses of the building’s house and barn, and replace it with a larger piece, and also to construct a new detached garage.

Tim Hess from Studio Insitu Architects, Inc. was present to discuss the application with the Historic Districts Commission (HDC). Mr. Hess presented the existing conditions and perspective views of the project. He pointed out a few changes including the north plain gable of main original house that continued to the back of the house, the bulk of the addition with the shed dormer being a little more subtle, the repositioning of windows, and the addition of a pair of French doors.

Mr. Riepe asked Mr. Hess to review all of the plans briefly with the HDC. Mr. Hess discussed the proposed changes that would be made to the existing building and described what the new proposed addition and modifications would look like.

Mr. Taylor asked if any members of the public wished to speak regarding the application.

Anuraj Shah of 257 Concord Road stated he preferred the proposed plans presented. He noted the changes to the ridge height on the north side elevation were a good improvement.

Mr. Taylor agreed with Mr. Shah's comment regarding the lowering of the ridge height on the north elevation. He stated he liked the proposed French doors and asked if the windows on the north view looking at the barn side to the left of the door were 6 over 6 windows. Mr. Taylor also asked if the windows to the left of the addition were 6 over 6 windows and were the windows being replaced. Mr. Hess replied no, indicating those windows were existing and were not being replaced.

Mr. Taylor stated the HDC had received an email from Taryn Trexler of 253 Concord Road regarding the three existing diamond windows, and asked if the one window that was going to be removed could be reused and put somewhere else on the building. Mr. Hess replied he would have to speak with his clients. Owner Norma Jeanne Buoniconti stated they would be willing to reuse the window if it was salvageable.

Mr. Riepe stated he preferred the plans presented to the HDC that evening.

Mr. Taylor motioned to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for 248 Concord Road based on the plans presented that night, April 2, 2020, with the following conditions: the existing diamond window on the west elevation will replace the square window on the north elevation, if feasible; the doors are to be Pella Architectural series same measurements and in wood; the north elevation French doors will be the same specifications as the south elevation; and all windows shall be made of wood. Mr. Riepe seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Taylor – Aye, Andreas – Aye, Hawes – Aye, and Riepe – Aye.

3. Public Hearing – Case 20-07, 353 Boston Post Road (Assessor's Map K09-0051), Applicant Laura Meier, Trustee, seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to finish the installation of replacement windows.

Applicant Laura Meier was present to discuss the application with the HDC. Ms. Meier stated the application was a continuation of a previous application regarding windows that had already been approved. She indicated she was requesting approval to match the windows that were already in place.

Mr. Taylor noted that legally the new application was not a continuation because the continuation would have needed approval and there was a limit of continuation time. He stated

the new application would require a new Certificate of Appropriateness for the new windows proposed for installation. Mr. Taylor indicated it appeared as though some new windows were installed at one point in time and the rest of the windows were going to be installed at a later time.

Ms. Meier stated when she applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness and sought approval for the windows that were now already installed, she was told the building was not within the local historic district. She referenced the information she had in writing, which was in the packet materials submitted to the HDC. Ms. Meier restated she had applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness in 2004 for some new windows to be installed and she had installed them. Now she was told her property was within a local historic district and needed HDC approval for the replacement of the remaining old windows.

Mr. Taylor reviewed the Certificate of Appropriateness application from 2004 which included a new asphalt roof and windows, but it was unclear what was approved on the certificate.

Ms. Meier replied no Certificate of Appropriateness was issued for a new roof or new windows in 2004 because she was told she did not need approval from the HDC at that time. She pointed out the note on the bottom of the Certificate of Appropriateness application stating her property was not in a historic district.

Mr. Riepe noted the old application was from 2004 and since then the area of the historic district had been extended to include the subject property. He added that at the time of Ms. Meier's application in 2004, the information she was given was correct and her property was not in a historic district.

Ms. Meier stated she intended to comply with the HDC guidelines in 2004, but did not need approval and installed new windows on 1/3 of building. She indicated she would now simply like to match the windows which had already been installed. Ms. Meier added she did not want to take out the windows that had been installed back in the mid-2000s.

Mr. Riepe stated that would not happen but noted it was unclear on the application where the proposed windows would be installed. Ms. Meier indicated all but the two front picture windows and the new ones on the back would be replaced, and referred to the pictures submitted with her application materials.

Mr. Riepe asked if her proposed plan was to install new windows on the west elevation and to replace windows on the dormers of the second floor. Ms. Meier stated that was correct and noted the new windows already installed on the barn added onto the building included the side and the entire renovation addition done back in 2004.

Mr. Taylor indicated the HDC would not ask her to remove the new windows but had concerns about installing vinyl windows on an older building. He asked Ms. Meier if she was familiar with the HDC guidelines for windows and Ms. Meier indicated she was familiar with the guidelines.

Ms. Meier also stated she resided in a historic district and had seen plenty of houses on her street without wood windows.

Mr. Taylor stated the HDC provided guidelines and had been insisting on having owners restore their windows, particularly with buildings of this age and in this good of condition. He asked Ms. Meier if she had done any research on the possible restoration of the windows. Ms. Meier stated the existing old windows were falling out.

Ms. Meier noted the property was in the newspaper, and people were excited she had bought the building and agreed to renovate it. Over the years she had been picking at it and was now at the point of replacing the windows since they do not work or function properly.

Mr. Taylor stated he did not agree the windows needed to be replaced but if he knew the cost of restoring the windows it might make a difference. He noted he would like to see the comparison of restoring the windows verses installing new windows.

Ms. Meier asked Mr. Taylor to explain what he meant by restoration of the windows. Mr. Taylor replied the original windows would be taken out and restored by working on the wood, replacing missing pieces, etc., and putting them back together which may be a better alternative than putting in new windows. He also noted it could be less money or more money, but would not know the answer to that until an estimate was given. Mr. Taylor noted it was an advantage to keep the older windows and preferred the windows to stay.

Ms. Meier indicated the windows were not thermos pane and did not keep the heat in the building. Mr. Taylor stated the HDC webpage contained substantial information on windows, and pointed out thermos pane windows were good windows but not necessarily better than just having a good storm window or air tight windows.

Ms. Meier stated the windows she was proposing had been accepted on many other streets located in historic districts. Mr. Taylor stated the HDC had precedence they followed and for some buildings they were not concerned with the type of windows being installed due to their younger age. He noted the HDC recently rewrote their guidelines for cases such as this where the Applicant was required to get an estimate for restoration of the windows and present it to the HDC.

Ms. Meier indicated she was not looking to restore the windows because they do not function properly or keep the heat in the building. She did not feel the current windows were practical. Mr. Taylor stated the HDC would not be asking for an estimate on the windows if they did not think the windows could be sufficient for the building, keep in the heat, and be economical. He asked Ms. Meier to obtain an estimate to restore the windows, to present it to the HDC, and then the HDC would have something to compare.

Ms. Meier stated she had already installed the windows she wanted on 1/3 of the building and she was not looking to install mismatched windows on the remainder of the building. She

indicated it was her intention to have matching windows on the building and she was not looking for anything different than what was already installed on many buildings in the historic districts.

Mr. Riepe noted the building was an antique, was particularly visible, and was older than many of the other buildings in the district. He pointed out the plaque on the building read 1790, noted there were very few buildings in town that were this old, and felt a building that was a rare valuable antique home should be preserved. Mr. Riepe stated there were a few companies who specialized in the restoration of windows.

Ms. Meier stated the windows would not match if they were restored. Mr. Taylor noted the windows may not match and it was not a perfect solution, but putting in newer windows would not be a good fit for an older building. Ms. Meier reiterated installing windows that did not match was not her end goal and would like to have a building where all the windows matched. She noted when she replaced the windows in 2004 she tried to get a Certificate of Appropriateness but did not need one.

Mr. Andreas stated the windows installed in 2004 were not relevant now because at the time the property was not in a local historic district. He indicated he did not think the HDC would approve vinyl windows on a 1790 house. Ms. Meier stated the HDC had approved the windows before and she knew of at least three others houses with vinyl windows in the historic district. Mr. Andreas noted that might be the case but the homes were not from 1790. He suggested investigating the cost of restoring the windows, to look at similar windows that were currently on the rear of the building in wood, to look at old photos of the building, and look at what the older windows looked like.

Ms. Meier stated the windows there now were not the original 1790 windows. Mr. Taylor stated the current windows may not be the originals, but they were still old and had historic value. He pointed out this was why the HDC would like to see an estimate for restoring the windows so they could conduct a pricing comparison.

Anuraj Shah of 257 Concord Road commented on the HDC's request to restore the windows. He mentioned he had the windows on his own home restored and it was a much lower cost than installing brand new wood windows. Ms. Meier asked Mr. Shah if he used one of the companies mentioned by the HDC and Mr. Shah replied he had simply used a carpenter for the restoration.

Mr. Andreas noted Ms. Meier did not have to use a window restoration company, as she could simply use a carpenter, but he pointed out a window restoration company might have a faster turnaround time.

Mr. Riepe motioned to continue the public hearing for the 353 Boston Post Road Certificate of Appropriateness application to the Historic Districts Commission meeting on May 7, 2020. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Taylor – Aye, Andreas – Aye, Hawes – Aye, and Riepe – Aye.

4. Public Hearing – Case 20-08, 289 Concord Road (Assessor’s Map H09-0008), Applicant Ramon Llamas seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish and replace an addition at the rear of the residence, including the relocation of windows.

Applicant Ramon Llamas was present to discuss the application with the HDC. He stated the room at the rear of the home was poorly insulated and also had some additional problems including with the foundation. Mr. Llamas referred to the plan set pointing out the left side elevations showing the existing three windows that were bunched together. He noted the proposal called for spreading the windows out a bit which would coincide with the windows on the rest of the house. Mr. Llamas stated he planned to repurpose the wood windows that were there now, to continue the cedar clapboard siding, and would be removing the skylights. He also indicated his goal was to stay within the same footprint of the existing foundation.

Mr. Riepe stated the proposed plans seemed to be a great improvement.

Mr. Andreas stated the trim looked nice and asked Mr. Llamas if he was planning to reuse the existing block foundation. Mr. Llamas replied he was and also planned to shore up the foundation because it was too shallow.

Mr. Andreas recommended if the plan was to keep the concrete block foundation, Mr. Llamas should consider facing it. Mr. Llamas asked Mr. Andreas to explain his recommendation of facing the foundation. Mr. Andreas stated facing would be applying a skim coat of concrete/mortar/stucco on the foundation. Mr. Riepe added that if a skim coat of mortar was applied it would make it a structurally better foundation. Mr. Taylor stated a stone veneer on the concrete block to match what was existing on other areas of the foundation might also be a good option. Mr. Llamas indicated he would research all of the suggestions.

Mr. Taylor asked if the doors would be reused. Mr. Llamas replied the doors were in poor condition. Mr. Taylor noted the windows were two over two on the house and the French doors might fit better by adding a grill or simulated French door. Mr. Llamas replied he would research that suggestion.

Mr. Riepe asked if the plan was to reuse the existing windows and only replace the doors. Mr. Llamas indicated that was correct.

Mr. Andreas asked if the siding was going to be reused. Mr. Llamas replied it would not, but the new siding material would match that of the existing house.

Mr. Andreas recommended a condition be added to the Certificate of Appropriateness that the siding and trim shall match the materials and color on the existing house.

Mr. Andreas motioned to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for 289 Concord Road based on the plans presented with the following conditions: materials and colors for the siding and trim on the addition should match the existing house; and facing the existing foundation in a manner appropriate to match the existing house is permitted, if desired.

Mr. Riepe seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Taylor – Aye, Andreas – Aye, Hawes – Aye, and Riepe – Aye.

5. Public Hearing – Case 20-09, 0 King Philip Road (Assessor’s Map K09-0041), Applicant Ben Maiden of SHKBEN Development LLC seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new, approximately 5,500 square foot, single-family dwelling.

Ben Maiden of Shkben Development LLC was present to discuss the application with the HDC. He presented the front, rear, and side elevations as well as the current site plan set to the HDC. Mr. Maiden stated he had read the HDC guidelines and tried to follow them through in his design.

Mr. Taylor noted the house at 17 King Philip Road had a lot of additions and felt it was out of character with the other buildings on the street. He felt the proposal for the subject property was exactly the same and though it was a nice house, it appeared to be far too big for the lot. Mr. Taylor stated he did not feel he could support approving the proposal at this time. He indicated a 3,000 to 3,500 square foot home would fit much better on a lot of this size and he did not feel there was even a need to discuss materials or changes at this point in time.

Ms. Hawes stated she lived on King Philp Road and noted that because this was a corner lot there did not appear to be much room to build on the property. She indicated the lot had a lot of water on it, was swampy, and might be difficult to build upon. Ms. Hawes agreed with Mr. Taylor’s comments and suggested a simple colonial dwelling would be much more presentable on this street.

Mr. Andreas stated the lot had some technical issues and might even have conservation restrictions because of wetland areas. He asked if percolation testing had been conducted for the septic system and Mr. Maiden replied testing had been conducted (10 test pits).

Mr. Andreas asked if any research about the property had been conducted. He noted he believed there were three old foundations buried on the property and it might be worth doing a little poking around in the dirt where the proposed house was going to be built. Mr. Andreas also stated there were some larger homes on that street and a proposed 4,000 square foot home in a different style might be a better fit. Mr. Andreas stated very few residences had porches in the neighborhood, many homes had bay windows, and he suggested looking at homes in the neighborhood to compare sizes to the proposal that might be a better fit.

Mr. Maiden thanked the HDC members for their feedback and suggestions, and mentioned the project team had poked around the lot while doing test pits because of the different buried foundations on the property were a concern.

Mr. Andreas discussed some of the different structures that had been on the property including an old pedestrian path that went through the lot.

Ms. Hawes asked if the house could be moved or pushed towards the Boston Post Road/Route 20 area of the lot.

Mr. Andreas stated that if the house were rotated 90 degrees it might avoid a lot of the wetlands on the property.

Mr. Riepe stated the house was very large for the street and the property had a lot of disadvantages. He indicated it seemed uneconomical and a very expensive house for not being in a great location. Mr. Riepe noted his concerns regarding the volume and appearance of the house, and would like to see it scaled down and visually closer to the ground. He stated he would like to see something more modest and in keeping with the neighborhood.

Paul Mahoney from Mahoney Architects recapped some of the comments from the HDC members. He stated his takeaway from the comments was that the HDC was looking for something a little simpler and smaller in scale. Mr. Mahoney noted the proposed house was actually 4,700 square feet and the 5,500 square foot number included the finished basement. He then discussed his ideas of different ways to simplify the house, to make it smaller, the materials, the windows, and color scheme. Mr. Mahoney asked the HDC to explain their comment regarding rotating the home. Mr. Riepe replied to rotate the house it would have to be a completely different design, perhaps a narrower façade, and it would present differently.

Mr. Riepe noted he liked the fact the house faced King Philip Road.

Mr. Andreas stated it might be worthwhile to take a look at the Raymond House on Raymond Road.

Mr. Riepe motioned to continue the public hearing for the 0 King Philip Road Certificate of Appropriateness application to the Historic Districts Commission meeting on May 7, 2020. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Taylor – Aye, Andreas – Aye, Hawes – Aye, and Riepe – Aye.

6. Public Hearing – Case 20-10, 47 Concord Road (Assessor’s Map K09-0002), Applicant John Noble seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to add a shed roof to the north side of a barn, move existing shrubs, and possibly add a fence and shrubs.

Applicant John Noble was present to discuss the application with the HDC. He stated the barn had been moved about 1.5 years ago so a pool could be installed where the original barn was located. Mr. Noble proposed installing a fence for privacy on the side of the home that faced Concord Road. The fence would be 6 feet high with cedar posts and contain 6 to 8 inch wide panels in a herringbone pattern to match the pattern on the barn. The herringbone pattern would be painted in an off white color to match the trim on the existing house.

Mr. Taylor asked if the herringbone design would be tongue and groove cedar, and Mr. Noble indicated it would.

Mr. Andreas asked what the legal requirements were for a fence around a pool. Mr. Noble replied 45 inches were required between the top of the bottom rung and bottom of the top rung. He also noted they were proposing a 6 foot high fence for privacy reasons.

Mr. Noble stated the left end of the fence would have a 3 foot wide gate with the same herringbone design where the proposed addition would be.

Mr. Riepe noted the shed looked to be simple and straightforward with a good design.

Mr. Noble described the shed details including the siding, stain color, roof line, trim boards, French doors, and 6 over 6 windows.

Mr. Andreas asked if the Beauty Bush was going to be moved and Mr. Noble indicated it would.

Mr. Taylor motioned to approve the application for 47 Concord Road as submitted with all landscaping alterations being optional. Mr. Riepe seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Taylor – Aye, Andreas – Aye, Hawes – Aye, and Riepe – Aye.

Other Business:

Approval of Minutes from March 5, 2020

Mr. Taylor motioned to approve the minutes of March 5, 2020. Ms. Hawes seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Taylor – Aye, Andreas – Aye, Hawes – Aye, and Riepe – Aye.

Administrative Report/Update

Mr. Taylor adjourned the meeting at 8:56 PM.